UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Joseph Ricci,
Plaintiff

v.
Duran, et al.,
Defendants

Order Dismissing Action

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00415-JAD-VCF

Plaintiff Joseph Ricci brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at the North Valley Complex of the Clark County Detention Center. On February 9, 2020, I ordered Ricci to file a first-amended complaint by March 11, 2020. I expressly warned him that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case. The deadline has passed, and Ricci has not filed a first-amended complaint.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case.⁴ A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁵ In determining whether to

24 ||

¹ ECF No. 10 (complaint).

² ECF No. 9 (order).

 $^{^3}$ Id.

⁴ Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁵ See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.

dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case. The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁸ Ricci was warned that his case would be dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim if he failed to file a first-amended complaint by March 11, 2020.9 So, Ricci had adequate warning that his failure to file a firstamended complaint by the deadline would result in this case's dismissal.

16 ///

17 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

/// 18

19 ///

///

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

20

1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

⁶ Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

⁷ See Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

⁸ Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 F.2d at 132–33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424.

⁹ ECF No. 9 (order).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED with prejudice for failure to state a claim based on Ricci's failure to file a first-amended complaint in compliance with this court's February 9, 2020, order; and The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE. DATED: 3-24-2020 U.S. District Judge Jennifer